

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful examination given to the present application. The application has been reviewed in light of the Office action, and it is respectfully submitted that the application as amended is patentable over the art of record.

Claims 1-6 and 9-12 have been amended. Claims 7-8 have been canceled. Claim 13 has been added. No new matter has been added.

The drawings are objected to. The specification has been amended to add the reference sign 1 to the term "input-side acoustic/electric transducer" on page 3, line 19. The drawing of Fig. 3 has been amended to correct the abbreviation notation of the electric/mechanical transducer.

The specification has been objected to. The specification has been amended as suggested by the examiner. The specification has also been amended to correct typographical errors. An abstract has been provided and is enclosed herewith on a separate sheet.

Claims 5, 10, and 11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form. Claims 4-5 have been amended to depend only on claim 1. Claim 10 has been rewritten in independent form, and claim 11 has been amended to depend only on claim 10.

Claims 1-4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Engebretson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,548,082). Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly point out and claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. For the following reasons, the examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

Engebretson does not disclose that "an input impedance of the electric/mechanical output

transducer is selectively switched from one value to another” as recited in claim 1. Similar language is found in claim 6. Engebretson discloses an input transducer 77 which is followed by a signal processing unit 113 (col. 10, lines 53-66; Fig. 4). However, in Engebreston, the electric/mechanical output transducers 79, 81 do not have an input impedance which may be selectively switched (col. 10, lines 3-53; Fig. 4).

The input impedances of Engebreston’s output transducers 79, 81 are fixed, and the description of the output transducers 79, 81 does not disclose or teach anything about the respective input impedance being switched. Furthermore, there is no control input taught to the Engebreston output transducer that could possibly be interpreted as switch control input for such impedances. Therefore, Engebreston does not disclose or teach that the an input impedance of the electric/mechanical output transducer is selectively switched from one value to another. Thus, Engebreston does not teach all the elements of the claimed invention.

Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 13 has been added with the subject matter of claim 9, and therefore is in condition for allowance. Claims 7-8 have been canceled.

Claim 12 is allowed.


In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No. 09/706,188
Amdt. Dated June 16, 2003
Reply to Office action of December 18, 2003

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same
to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33109.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Suzanne B. Gagnon, Reg. No. 48924

526 Superior Avenue, East
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1484
(216) 579-1700

Date: June 16, 2003